

U.S. Application No. 10/587,692 -- 4

REMARKS

Claims 5, 6, and 8 remain in this application. Claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 5 and 8 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application in view of the amendments noted is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 7. Accordingly, claim 7 has been canceled, and claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 5 instead of canceled claim 7.

In the Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright (U.S. Patent No. 589,520, hereinafter "Wright"). Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Krambrock (U.S. Patent No. 5,397,062, hereinafter "Krambrock"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

With respect to independent claim 5, as noted above, claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 7.

Further, Krambrock does not disclose an outflow regulating valve connected to a hyperbaric chamber outlet, the outflow regulating valve including a main body, an outflow adjustment needle moveable in the main body, a valve distance adjustment ring disposed around the main body, a valve setting main structure connected to the main body, and a mechanical set for outflow fine adjustment including moveable claws cooperable with the outflow adjustment needle, as claim 5 now requires.

The draw rod 26, which is connected to the upper movable nozzle half 9 and leads to the control device 27, is not an outflow adjustment needle moveable in the main body as presently claimed. The draw rod 26 is not disposed in the tubular conveyor line 2 of the housing cutout 22, and the draw rod 26 extends away from the housing cutout 22 to the control device 27 (see FIG. 2). Also, the draw rod 26 is not cooperable with both of the two nozzle halves 8, 9. Instead, the draw rod 26 is only cooperable with the upper nozzle half 9 (see column 5, lines 5 – 14 and FIG. 2). Therefore, Krambrock does not disclose or fairly suggest a mechanical set for outflow fine adjustment including moveable claws cooperable with the outflow adjustment needle moveable in the main body, as claim 5 requires.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 21 2011

U.S. Application No. 10/587,692 -- 5

Further, the movable diaphragm 28, which is the control device of Krambrock, is not a valve distance adjustment ring that is disposed around the main body, as presently claimed. The movable diaphragm 28 of Krambrock is separate from and spacedly disposed in relation to the housing cutout 22 (see FIG. 2). The movable diaphragm 28 is not disposed around the housing cutout 22. Thus, Krambrock does not disclose or fairly suggest a valve distance adjustment ring that is disposed around the main body, as claim 5 requires.

And as admitted by the Office Action, Wright does not disclose an outflow regulating valve. Therefore, Wright does not remedy the deficiencies of Krambrock.

For these reasons, claim 5 is patentable over any combination of Wright with Krambrock. Claim 8, depending from claim 5, is also patentable over Wright and Krambrock. Claim 7 has been canceled, thereby obviating the rejection of this claim.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 5 as being unpatentable over Wright and the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 8 as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Krambrock be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Berg (U.S. Patent No. 4,792,290, hereinafter "Berg"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments made above with respect to the patentability of claim 5 over Burton. Based upon those arguments, claim 5 is patentable over Burton. Claim 6, depending from claim 5, is also patentable over Burton, and any combination of Burton with Berg.

Furthermore, Berg does not disclose that its accumulator 56 includes a mixture of water and nitrogen gas.

For these reasons, applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 6 as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Berg be withdrawn.

A Petition For A Three-Month Extension Of Time and a PTO-2038 authorizing payment in the amount of \$1,110.00 to cover the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a)(3) are included with this response.

U.S. Application No. 10/587,692 -- 6

This amendment and request for reconsideration is felt to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Segen Farid Estefen et al.
Fildes & Outland, P.C.



Christopher J. Fildes, Attorney
Registration No. 32,132
20916 Mack Avenue, Suite 2
Grosse Pointe Woods, MI 48236
(313) 885-1500